



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/609,007	06/27/2003	Steven D. Jacobs	2002P10431US01	8326	
75	90 03/22/2005		EXAM	INER	
Harold C. Moo	Harold C. Moore			KRISHNAMURTHY, RAMESH	
Maginot, Moore	e & Bowman				
Bank One Cente	Bank One Center/Tower			PAPER NUMBER	
111 Monument	111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000			3753	
Indianapolis, Il	N 46204-5115				

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(1)0-			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/609,007	JACOBS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ramesh Krishnamurthy	3753			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a RANDONE	mety filed ys will be considered timety. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 N	lovember 2003.				
<u> </u>	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under the state of the state o					
Disposition of Claims					
•	in.	•			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 - 26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	With the serious distriction.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 26</u> is/are rejected.					
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in Applica	ition No			
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been receiv	ved in this National Stage			
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receiv	/ed.			
Attachment(s)	e de la companya de				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summai	ry (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(s)/Mail I	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· === · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Art Unit: 3753

This office action is responsive to communications filed 11/24/2003.

Claims 1 – 26 are pending.

- 1. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) as follows: the provisional application upon which priority is claimed has a different inventorship. See MPEP § 201.11(IV.).
- 2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1, 3 5, 7 11, 13 15, 17 21 and 23 26 are rejected under 35
 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharp et al. (US 5,304,093).

Sharp et al. discloses an arrangement for calibrating a Venturi valve (Col. 4, lines 59 – 65), with the valve having a variable shaft position and calibration information is stored in the form of a curve relating the position of the actuator to the flow rate, with the position of the actuator being proportional to the voltage provided thereto. Sharp et al. note that (Col. 4, lines 65 – 68) that the relationship between actuator position (and hence the voltage supplied thereto) and the flow is logarithmic and thus non-linear whereby voltage differences between first set of voltages is inherently greater that between a second set of voltages. The characteristic curve shown in Fig. 2 is taken here to be a representation of the tabular relationship between the actuator voltage and

Application/Control Number: 10/609,007

Art Unit: 3753

the flow. The arrangement of Sharp et al. necessarily operates between a minimum and maximum voltage (See Fig. 1).

The arrangement disclosed by Sharp et al. necessarily performs the method recited in claims 11, 13 - 15 and 17 - 20.

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 2, 6, 12, 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharp et al. (US 5,304,093) as applied to claims 1, 3 5, 7 11, 13 15, 17 21 and 23 26 above, and further in view of EP 0 834 723.

The patent to Sharp et al. discloses the claimed invention with the exception of explicitly disclosing a verification procedure of the calibration.

The document EP '723 discloses (page 6, lines 55 – 58) that it is known in the art to verify the supplied calibration data for the purpose of obtaining a reliable calibration in actual use.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in the arrangement of Sharp et al. a procedure to verify the calibration data for the purpose of obtaining a reliable calibration in actual use, as recognized in EP 0 834 723. It is noted that the steps of providing the plurality of test voltages in a particular sequence would necessarily form part of the verification procedure since the calibration data in Sharp et al exists in the form of a relationship between the actuator position i.e. voltage supplied and the resulting flow.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramesh Krishnamurthy whose telephone number is (571) 272 – 4914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene L. Mancene, can be reached on (571) 272 - 4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 - 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 - 0861.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/609,007

Art Unit: 3753

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramesh Krishnamurthy, Ph.D., PE

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3753

Page 5